

Remarks and Arguments

Claims 1-42 were presented for examination. Claims 1, 15 and 29 have been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 15, 16, 21-25, 29, 30 and 35-39 have been rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0071559 (Christensen, previously cited) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0078159 (Petrogiannis, previously cited.)

The present invention relates to a method and apparatus for allowing a user who is connected to a content server and who is reviewing a document to request that the document be forwarded to another “recipient” user who may be outside of the user’s organization and, therefore, does not have access to the content server. As disclosed in the instant specification, the content server receives the document from a publisher. Since the user may also have restrictions on what he or she can do with the document content, a forwarding engine in the content server is used to send an e-mail message to the recipient user. The e-mail message contains a link to the document publisher and an identifier for the document, but does not contain the document content, which may be restricted.

Upon receiving the e-mail, the recipient user can log onto a forwarding server in the publisher – a server that is different from the content server to which the user has access. The forwarding server resolves the link, downloads a secure viewer program to the recipient user and then downloads an encrypted version of the requested document content to the viewer program. Subsequently, the secure viewer program requests a decryption key for the encrypted document and decrypts the document content. The recipient user can then view the document content in the secure viewer but cannot copy or print the document without permission from the publisher.

The claims recite this operation. Claim 1 is illustrative. It recites, in lines 7-13, “...preparing in the content server, an e-mail message that contains a link to the publisher and an identifier for the document, but does not contain the document content... [sending] the e-mail message to the recipient user wherein, upon receiving the e-mail, the recipient user logs onto a forwarding server at the document publisher, the forwarding server being different from the content server...” In the proposed Christensen/Petrogiannis combination, the examiner equates the recited content server

to the proponent server in Petrogiannis and the e-mail sent in Petrogiannis to the recited e-mail. However, there are several differences. First, as previously mentioned, the ID in the Petrogiannis e-mail identifies the recipient user, not the document. The examiner replies that a document identifier is disclosed in Christensen. While applicant agrees that a document identifier is disclosed in Christensen, that identifier is downloaded to the user not sent to the recipient user in an e-mail as recited in claim 1. Second, the Petrogiannis e-mail includes the document content (encrypted or unencrypted). Claim 1 recites that the e-mail does not include the document content. Third, as recited in claim 1, after receiving the e-mail, the recipient user logs onto a forwarding server that is different from the content server. In the Christensen/Petrogiannis combination, the recipient user logs onto the proponent server (= the content server.)

Claim 1 further recites, in lines 14-19, "...receiving and resolving the link at the publisher and downloading from the forwarding server, a secure viewer program to the recipient user and an encrypted version of the requested document content to the secure viewer program ... requesting a decryption key for the encrypted document from the forwarding server with the secure viewer program..." In the Christensen/Petrogiannis combination suggested by the examiner, the secure viewer, the encrypted document and the decryption key would be downloaded from the content server, not a different forwarding server as recited.

Consequently, the combination of Christensen and Petrogiannis does not teach or suggest the combination recited in claim 1 and claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference combination. In order to make claim 1 read onto a combination of Christensen and Petrogiannis, it would be necessary to extract the separate features from the references and recombine them in a manner not taught by the references. Such an exercise is clearly incorrect.

Claims 2 and 7-11 are dependent on claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 1.

Claim 15 contains limitations that parallel those in claim 1 and consequently distinguishes over the cited reference combination in the same manner as claim 1.

Claims 16 and 21-25 are dependent on claim 15 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 15.

Claim 29 contains limitations that parallel those in claim 1 and consequently distinguishes over the cited reference combination in the same manner as claim 1.

Claims 30 and 35-39 are dependent on claim 29 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, they distinguish over the cited references in the same manner as claim 29.

Claims 3-6, 12, 17-20, 26, 31-34 and 40 have been rejected as obvious over U.S. Christensen in view of Petrogiannis and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0117247 (Agrawal, previously cited.) Claims 3-6 and 12 are dependent on claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. As discussed above the combination of Christensen and Petrogiannis does not teach or suggest these limitations. Adding Agrawal to this combination cannot teach or suggest the missing teachings since Agrawal is not directed to securely downloading documents and relates only to electronic commerce transactions. Therefore, claims 3-6 and 12 patentably distinguish over the cited combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Agrawal.

Claims 17-20 and 26 are dependent on claim 15 and incorporate the limitations thereof. As discussed above the combination of Christensen and Petrogiannis does not teach or suggest these limitations and adding Agrawal to this combination does not change this teaching. Therefore, claims 17-20 and 26 patentably distinguish over the cited combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Agrawal.

Claims 31-34 and 40 are dependent on claim 29 and incorporate the limitations thereof. As discussed above the combination of Christensen and Petrogiannis does not teach or suggest these limitations and adding Agrawal to this combination does not change this teaching. Therefore, claims 31-34 and 40 patentably distinguish over the cited combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Agrawal.

Claims 13, 27 and 41 have been rejected as obvious over U.S. Christensen in view of Petrogiannis and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087661 (Matichuk, previously cited.) Matichuk claim 4, to which the examiner refers, recites that the other web sites maintain a count of the number of times a link to them is selected. However, present claims 13, 27 and 41 recite that the link itself maintains a count of the

number of times it is selected. Consequently, the combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Matichuk does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

Claims 14, 28 and 42 have been rejected as obvious over U.S. Christensen in view of Petrogiannis further in view of Matichuk and still further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0103044 (Vandewater, previously cited.) Claims 14, 28 and 42 are dependent on claims 13, 27 and 41 and incorporate the limitations thereof. As discussed above, the combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Matichuk does not disclose the limitations recited in claims 13, 27 and 41. Since Vandewater also does not disclose a link that itself maintains a count of the number of times it is selected, the combination of Christensen, Petrogiannis and Matichuk with Vandewater does not disclose the invention as claimed. Therefore, claims 14, 28 and 42 patentably distinguish over the cited reference combination.

In light of the forgoing amendments and remarks, this application is now believed in condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the examiner has any further questions regarding this amendment, he is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below. The examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or direct any payment under 37 C.F.R. §§1.17, 1.16 to Deposit Account number 50-3969.

Respectfully submitted

/paul e. kudirka/
Paul E. Kudirka, Esq. Reg. No. 26,931
LAW OFFICES OF PAUL E. KUDIRKA
Customer Number 64967
Tel: (617) 357-0010 Fax: (617) 357-0035

Date: 2007-10-01